REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-18 are pending in the application, that claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 9 stand rejected and that claims 11-18 are allowed. The Examiner further stated that claims 4, 6, 8, and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response, the Applicant has amended the claims as indicated by the Examiner in pointing out allowable subject matter and thus placing the above identified patent application in condition for allowance. More specifically, claims 1, 6 and 8 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and claim 4 has been cancelled.

In view of the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of these claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Thus the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections

A.   35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected the Applicant's claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hurst (U.S. Patent No. 4,069,500).

The Examiner alleges that regarding claim 1, Hurst teaches a repetitive cyclic test signal generator including all of the elements of the Applicant's invention. However, the Examiner concedes that Hurst fails to teach, suggest or anticipate at least the limitations of the Applicant's claim 4.

In response, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4, as suggested by the Examiner, to place claim 1 in condition for allowance. More specifically, the Applicant has essentially rewritten claim 4 in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim to place claim 1 in allowable form as suggested by the Examiner.

Having done so, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Hurst and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-3 and 5-10 depend either directly from independent claim 1 and recite additional features therefor. As such and for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-3 and 5-10 are also not anticipated by the teachings of Hurst. Therefore the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-3 and 5-10 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are patentable thereunder.

Conclusion

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter. The Applicant has herein amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to place the above identified Patent Application in condition for allowance. Thus the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Loew

By: _____
Jorge Tony Villabon, Attorney
Reg. No. 52,322
(609) 734-6445

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

May 19, 2006

-6-